

Washington Assessment of Student Learning
Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS)

2003

Technical Report

Prepared by
The Riverside Publishing Company

for
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 47220
Olympia, Washington 98504-7220

March 2004

	Title	Page
Part 1	Overview and Background	
	Introduction	1
	Purpose of the Portfolio Assessment	2
	Participation Rates	3
Part 2	Scoring	4
Part 3	Reliability of the Portfolio Assessment	
	Introduction	6
	Inter-Scorer Agreement	7
	Coefficient Alpha	8
Part 5	Description of Performance of Students	9
Part 6	Reporting Relative to Standards	
	Introduction	12
	Performance Relative to Standards	13
Appendix A	Alternate Assessment Task Force – 1997 to August 2000	16
Appendix B	Alternate Assessment Curriculum Work Group – February 2000	17
Appendix C	Alternate Assessment Advisory Panel – November 2000 to present	18
Appendix D	Participation Guidelines for Washington Alternate Assessment System	19
Appendix E	WAAS Washington Alternate Assessment System Demographic Information	20
Appendix F	Washington Alternate Assessment Portfolio Scoring Summary –2003	21
Appendix G	Washington Alternate Assessment System Portfolio Academic Achievement Standard Descriptions	23
Appendix H	Relationship Among Total Score, Level, and Score Patterns	24

Part 1: Overview and Background

Introduction

The *Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS)* was administered operationally for the third year during the spring of 2003. The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA/APA/NCME, 1999) recommends that test developers and publishers produce a technical manual that provides information documenting the technical quality of an assessment, including evidence for the reliability and validity of test scores. This document contains the technical information for the 2003 WAAS.

State assessment programs provide one method of determining student academic achievement. The Washington State Assessment System provides accountability for program and educational opportunities for all students. Alternate assessment, as part of Washington's assessment program, ensures a unified system, program, and student accountability linked to the common core of learning within the general curriculum.

The Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) process was developed by the Washington Alternate Assessment Task Force (Appendix A) and expanded by Advisory Panels (Appendix B and C) in response to the following requirement in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1997: "The State has established goals for the performance of children with disabilities in the state that . . . are consistent, to the maximum extent appropriate, with other goals and standards for children established by the state." The alternate assessments are based on Washington's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) in the content areas of Communication, Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. The state has prepared extensions for the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR). This document provides the critical function of the EALRs, the access skills, instructional activities, and assessment strategies that are designed to assist special education staff members in linking functional IEP skills to the EALRs, in providing access to the general education curriculum, and in measuring student progress toward achieving the EALRs. The most current version of the EALR extensions document can be found at:

http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/pubdocs/EALR_Extension%20Guide_Oct_02.pdf.

The inclusion of students with disabilities in the assessment and accountability system is critical to ensure appropriate allocation of resources and learning opportunities for these students.

The Washington Alternate Assessment System was designed for a very small percentage of the total school population for the *Washington Assessment of Student Learning* (WASL), even with accommodations, would be an inappropriate measure of progress (Appendix D). Prior to 2003 there were two options available for the alternate assessment system: commercially available tests and portfolio assessment. For 2003, the commercially available tests option for alternate assessment was no longer available due to federal requirements for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Purpose of the Portfolio Assessment

The Washington Alternate Assessment Task force, made up of administrators, higher education personnel, teachers, and parents, determined the following two-fold purpose of the portfolio assessment:

- To provide an appropriate method of measuring progress on state goals and standards for students who are not able to access the WASL or any commercially available test, even with accommodations and
- To ensure that students will be able to generalize the Individualized Education Program (IEP) skills to the maximum extent possible.

The basic building block of the portfolio assessment is evidence of the student's performance and progress toward reaching IEP goals. Each of the entries in the portfolio documents two dimensions of learning: progress on IEP skills linked to the EALRs and student generalization of those skills.

Portfolio evidence should demonstrate participation in and progress toward those IEP goals that are aligned to state standards (EALRs). In this way, evidence of progress on IEP skills linked to the EALRs can measure progress on state goals and standards.

Portfolio evidence should also show the extent to which a student can demonstrate and generalize the IEP skill linked to EALRs in the following ways:

- using appropriate modifications/adaptations, supports, or assistive technology in order to demonstrate all he or she knows and is able to do;
- in a variety of settings and contexts in which the student is able to use learned skills. These places can include the classroom, other areas of the school, community settings, and home;
- interacting with nondisabled peers and others during IEP activities for the purpose of developing social relationships to enrich his or her life; and
- using self-determination skills in planning, monitoring and evaluating IEP skill activities.

Participation Rates

Federal guidance letters indicate that states should develop alternate assessment participation guidelines so that approximately 1-2% of the student population is eligible for an alternate assessment in each given year. As can be seen in Table 1 the number of portfolios submitted is less than 1% of the number of student assessed in 2003. As can be seen in comparing Table 1 and 2, there was a considerable increase in the number of portfolios submitted. In 2002, a total of 427 portfolios were submitted while in 2003 there were 1,642 portfolios submitted. Although the number of portfolios submitted for

Table 1: Number of Students Assessed in Grades 4, 7, 8 and 10 in 2003

	Total Number of Students					
	Washington Assessment of Student Learning					Portfolio Submitted
	Listening	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	
Gr4	74,207	75,040	74,711	75,224		695
Gr7	78,363	78,588	77,990	78,779		425
Gr8					71,963	174
Gr10	69,029	69,622	68,649	70,213	61,937	352

Table 2: Number of Students Assessed in Grades 4, 7 and 10 by Type of Assessment in 2002

	Total Number of Students				
	Commercially Available Test Only				Portfolio Submitted
	Listening	Reading	Writing	Math	
Grade 4	971	1,397	1,287	1,212	171
Grade 7	625	969	944	898	140
Grade 10	409	704	701	689	116

Grade 8 Science was lower than for the numbers submitted for other grades. This lower participation rate was not unexpected given that this was the first year for voluntary participation in science. The number of portfolios submitted in 2003 was less than the total number of students assessed in the alternative assessment system (including both Commercially Available Tests and Portfolios) last year.

Part 2: Scoring

The portfolios were scored over a two-week period in June. For the first week, a small group of teachers and representatives from the Riverside Publishing Company (RPC) and Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM) were led by OSPI staff in range finding. Teachers, RPC and PEM personnel were trained by OSPI so that they all had a common understanding of scoring dimension definitions and score points for each dimension in the portfolio.

There are five scoring dimensions divided into two parts, with one dimension scored on specific content area sections of the portfolio and four dimensions scored across the entire portfolio. Part I scores for Progress on IEP skills are determined based on evidence in separate portfolio entries for Communication, Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. Part II scores for Student Generalization of Skills in four dimensions are determined by examining evidence across the entire portfolio. The content area Part I score is added to the total of the four dimension scores in Part II to obtain a Total Score for the content area. Thus, four separate total scores are generated for the student (one total score for each content area).

OSPI staff pre-selected a number of portfolios that exemplified score points for each dimension. First, two of the aforementioned portfolios were used as tools to train teachers, RPC and PEM staff. Teachers, RPC and PEM personnel were given one portfolio to score. When all were finished scoring, OSPI discussed each score given and consensus was achieved. This step was repeated three times.

Once teachers, RPC and PEM staff were trained to OSPI's standards, the group was divided into three groups of two teachers and one RPC or PEM staff. Each group scored portfolios and then all groups met to come to consensus. Appendix H shows the score sheet used. Fourteen portfolios were scored in this manner. RPC, PEM, and OSPI personnel reviewed all of the scored portfolios and selected four portfolios to be used in training teacher scorers. Scoring summaries and annotations were written to accompany the training sets for the Portfolio Scoring Institute.

The second week, additional teachers were used as scorers. The teachers who had attended the first week served as table leaders and the Riverside Publishing Company and Pearson Educational Measurement staff served as assistant table leaders. The first day was used as a full day of training, and scoring started on the second day. Teachers were trained by OSPI so that they all had a common understanding of dimension definitions and score points for each dimension in the portfolio. OSPI led the training on definitions of each dimension and its rubric. OSPI pre-selected two portfolios that exemplified all ranges of score points for each dimension. OSPI facilitated discussion of these portfolios. Teachers were given two portfolios to score independently. OSPI and RPC facilitated discussion upon completion of scoring. When OSPI and RPC concluded that all teachers were properly trained, scoring procedures were reviewed.

On the first day every portfolio was scored twice and the table leader (or assistant table leader) score was used as the final score. When clarification was needed, or discrepancies were found, OSPI staff served as the final arbiter.

Eight tables were established for scoring purposes. At each table there was a table leader (RPC person or teacher returning from range-finding) and four to five teacher scorers.

There was a lead scorer (OSPI) table, as well. Scorer reliability was calculated at this table. When clarification was needed, or discrepancies found, OSPI was the final arbiter.

Scorers chose a portfolio randomly. Portfolios were arranged according to school district. Scorers were told not to choose a portfolio from their district or their table leader's district. Scorers signed for one portfolio with its unique number. At each table was a sheet on which scorers were required to check in and out with their initials. Next, scorers scored the portfolios and then recorded their scores on content and dimension sheets. Scorers gave portfolio and paper work to table leader.

Table leaders initialed and scored each portfolio without looking at teacher scorers' results. Table leaders scored portfolio "blind." Table leaders filled out an entry form with each student's name and portfolio number. Table leaders filled in and transferred all scores onto bubble sheet. Table leaders handed each portfolio to lead scorer's table and scores were entered into a database.

Part 3: Reliability of the Portfolio Assessment

Introduction

The reliability of assessment scores is a measure of the degree to which the scores on the test are a "true" measure of the examinees' knowledge and skill relevant to the tested knowledge and skills. There are several ways to obtain estimates of score reliability: test-retest, alternate forms, internal consistency, and generalizability analysis are the most common. Test-retest estimates require administration of the same instrument at different times. In a sense a portfolio system is a collection of evidence from a full school year and as such should increase the reliability of the measurement of a student's ability. However, no evidence was collected to confirm this speculation. Alternate forms reliability estimates require administration of two parallel assessments. These tests must be created in such a way that we have confidence that they measure the same domain of knowledge and skills using different items. Unfortunately at this time there is only one set of evidence collected in the entry for each content area.

The scoring design for the 2002 assessment did not readily allow for estimating the rater variance component. However, inter-score agreement and coefficient alpha were two internal consistency measures used to estimate score reliability.

Inter-Scorer Agreement

Inter-scorer agreement is an important source of evidence for the reliability of test scores. When two trained judges agree with the score given to a student's work, this gives support for the score on the short-answer or extended response item. To determine the degree to which judges gave equivalent scores to the same student work the percent of agreement between scorers was examined. Reliability of scoring was determined by looking at the difference between the score from the teacher scorers and the table leader scorers (Table 3). Of the 1,646 portfolios scored, 855 or 51.9% of the portfolios had two scores. The percentage of exact agreement of scores or of a difference of only 1 is consistently around 90% with the exception of Grade 8 Science where the number was 83.9%. These numbers are consistent with the results from 2002. These percentages of agreement appear to be reasonable.

Table 3: Percentage Agreement Between First Scorer and Second Scorer

Amount of Agreement	Grade 4	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10
Scores exact the same	61.6%	64.1%	65.5%	65.1%
Scores are different by 1	27.8%	25.6%	18.2%	25.3%
Scores are different by 2	7.7%	7.3%	7.3%	6.7%
Scores are different by 3	2.9%	3.0%	9.0%	2.8%

Each day during the noon break and at the end of the day the reliability of each teacher and for the group were calculated by each dimension/trait. On day 2, 3, 4, and 5 portfolios scored by teachers who had 70% or above exact agreement received one score. One day 2 and 3 every third portfolio was double-scored by a table leader or assistant table leader to check on reliability. On day 4 and 5 every second portfolio was double-scored. In these cases, the table leader scores were still used as the final score. If teachers fell below 70% exact agreement, the portfolios they scored were double-scored on every portfolio. When reliabilities were low by trait, then the scorer was re-trained.

In a traditional large-scale assessment, there is a chance that a student's handwriting or neatness could influence a scorer's judgment of the portfolio evidence. In the case of the portfolios, the skill, training and ability of the person putting the portfolio together could influence the scorer's impression and score. As teachers gain more experience in this activity, it is likely that differences in portfolios from the ability of the teacher to select materials for the portfolio will even out, and it will be possible to ensure that the scores received are not unduly influenced by the presentation of the portfolio. For 2003, a new score, "Insufficient Evidence", was used for scoring that indicates that there is not enough evidence in the portfolio to score.

Coefficient Alpha

Coefficient Alpha is a score reliability index of internal scale consistency/homogeneity. Alpha can be estimated from scores obtained on one occasion and is appropriate when a score is intended to measure a single trait. Table 4 provides the Coefficient Alpha for the Total scores and Part II scores. As indicated in the associated formula, the value of Alpha is affected by the number of components making up a score, the variance of the individual components, and the total score variance. In the context of the WAAS Total scores and Part II scores, relatively higher values of Alpha will tend to result when the total scores have greater variability and/or the scores across the individual components are very similar (i.e., internally consistent). This reliability index is only sensitive to random errors associated with this source of score variability. It does not incorporate temporal errors (as would a test-retest reliability index) or random error associated with rater variance (addressed elsewhere in this document). Systematic sources of variance, such as rater effects, might artificially increase these values.

$$\text{Alpha} = (N/N-1) * (1 - \Sigma\text{Var}(\text{part})/\text{Var}(\text{total}))$$

Where N = Number of components combined to form total
 $\Sigma\text{Var}(\text{part})$ = Sum of the variance for the individual components
 $\Sigma\text{Var}(\text{total})$ = Variance of the total scores

Table 4: Coefficient Alpha for Total Scores and Part II Scores

	Total Score					
	Communication	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Part II
Grade 4	0.77	0.76	0.78	0.78	--	0.80
Grade 7	0.75	0.77	0.81	0.79	--	0.81
Grade 8	--	--	--	--	0.74	0.72
Grade 10	0.81	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.80	0.83

Part 5: Description of Performance of Students

Table 5 provides a summary of the percentage of students obtaining each of the scale scores in each dimension that was scored. As has occurred in the last two years the majority of students were given a scale score of 1 for most dimensions but there has been a reduction in the percent being given a score of 1 in 2003 compared to previous years. However, there tended to be fewer scores of 0 awarded this year compared to 2002. As well, there tended to be more scores of 2, 3, and 4 in 2003 than in 2002 and 2001. In 2001, at grade 10, no students were awarded a score of 4 on six of the eight dimensions while in 2002 only the dimension of Self Determination had 0% of students obtaining a 4 while 5.2% of the portfolios in Mathematics and 7.6% on Modifications were scored at level 4. In 2003, this trend continued with a greater percentage of students being awarded scores of 4. As in 2001 and 2002, the average score in 2003 for Modifications tend to be higher than the average score for the other dimensions. The scores awarded for Modifications tend to be more spread out than for the other dimensions as well.

Table 5: Percentage of Students Obtaining Each Score on the Portfolio By Grade**Grade 4**

		Part I				Part II			
		Communication	Reading	Writing	Math	Modifications	Settings	Social Relations	Self Determination
Percentage of Students Obtaining Each Score	0	2.8%	0.9%	1.6%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
	1	39.5%	41.9%	48.4%	46.4%	24.2%	45.1%	54.3%	62.3%
	2	31.3%	28.6%	28.2%	26.5%	22.3%	28.9%	33.2%	20.5%
	3	16.2%	13.5%	14.5%	13.9%	23.6%	17.6%	9.5%	7.7%
	4	10.2%	15.1%	7.3%	12.1%	29.5%	8.0%	2.6%	9.2%
Number of Portfolios Scored		501	644	614	619	665	665	665	665

Grade 7

		Part I				Part II			
		Communication	Reading	Writing	Math	Modifications	Settings	Social Relations	Self Determination
Percentage of Students Obtaining Each Score	0	4.1%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
	1	46.4%	46.6%	53.7%	50.5%	24.2%	44.4%	53.2%	66.3%
	2	26.0%	32.0%	27.1%	28.9%	23.3%	26.6%	31.1%	12.8%
	3	13.1%	10.2%	10.1%	11.5%	24.7%	16.6%	11.4%	7.6%
	4	10.4%	10.0%	7.9%	7.6%	27.3%	11.9%	3.8%	12.8%
Number of Portfolios Scored		366	410	406	408	421	421	421	421

Grade 8

		Part I	Part II			
		Science	Modifications	Settings	Social Relations	Self Determination
Percentage of Students Obtaining Each Score	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	1	52.7%	35.5%	51.5%	62.1%	71.0%
	2	19.5%	7.1%	19.5%	23.1%	9.5%
	3	14.8%	10.1%	9.5%	8.9%	7.7%
	4	13.0%	47.3%	19.5%	5.9%	11.8%
Number of Portfolios Scored		169	169	169	169	169

Grade 10

		Part I					Part II			
		Communication	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Modifications	Settings	Social Relations	Self Determination
Percentage of Students Obtaining Each Score	0	3.7%	0.6%	1.5%	1.2%	27.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
	1	47.7%	55.0%	56.9%	54.0%	44.6%	30.0%	42.9%	53.9%	62.1%
	2	24.2%	19.5%	19.1%	23.3%	11.8%	21.6%	20.1%	32.7%	19.2%
	3	16.8%	15.8%	16.0%	13.1%	9.8%	23.6%	22.2%	8.5%	10.5%
	4	7.7%	9.1%	6.5%	8.4%	5.9%	24.5%	14.6%	4.7%	7.9%
Number of Portfolios Scored		298	329	325	335	287	343	343	343	343

Part 6 – Reporting Relative To Standards

Introduction

The Federal legislation and regulations for ESEA and IDEA reauthorization requires states to report results for all students assessed using general assessments and alternate assessments relative to the same grade level academic content and achievement standards. In anticipation of the federal government publication of a Notice for Proposed Rule Making to allow setting alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who participate in alternate assessments, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction sought to establish four levels of performance based on alternate achievement standards on the WAAS assessments in the fall of 2002. A description of the standard setting procedures used can be found in the Washington Alternative Assessment System 2002 Technical Report. Additional information about meeting alternate achievement standards on the WAAS portfolio can be found at the following: Meeting Alternate Achievement Standards on the WAAS Portfolio (October 2003) (http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/pubdocs/Mtg_Alt_Ach_Std.doc).

Appendix G provides the descriptions of the achievement standards upon which the cut scores for the portfolio were established. To determine if a student meets standards, first the total score is determined by adding the score for each part one score (Part 1 score - Progress on IEP Skills score for the content area) to the total score for the part two dimension (Modifications and Adaptations, Settings and Contexts, Social Relationships, and Self-Determination). The second part of the decision rule requires a minimum score on the first scoring dimension (Progress on IEP Skill). The achievement level for any subject cannot be more than 1 level higher than the subject Part I dimension score. That is, a portfolio with a 1 in the Part I score cannot be in an achievement category higher than 2. A portfolio with a score of 2 in the Part I score cannot be in an achievement category higher than 3. Table 6 summarizes the decision rule. Portfolios with insufficient evidence are reported as not meeting the standard for accountability purposes. Appendix

H shows the relationship among the various total scores, level, and pattern of various scores.

Table 6: Decision Rule for Determining Level of Performance on WAAS portfolio

Level	Total Score*	Part I Score Required on Progress on IEP Skill
4	16 to 20	3 or 4
3	12 to 15	2 or 3 or 4
2	8 to 11	1 or 2 or 3 or 4
1	5 to 7	1 or 2 or 3

* Total score = progress in content area (Part I score) + mod + set + soc+ self. Portfolios with insufficient evidence are reported separately as IE and are not reported in one of the performance levels.

Performance Relative to Standards

Tables 7 through 11 show the number and percentage students achieving standards on the Portfolio Assessment for each content area. The achievement standards reported here were for the WAAS assessments and should not be compared to the results or standards for students taking the WASL.

The percent of students meeting standards showed a substantive increase in 2003. For 2003, the percentage of students meeting standards ranged from 18% to 25%. The percent achieving standards seem consistent across subjects and grades. In 2002, the range was between 4% and 12%.

Table 7: Number of Students Achieving Standards the WAAS in 2003 by Grade, Mathematics

	4th	7th	10th
Number of Students:			
Number Who Met Standard*:			
Level 4 (exceeding standard):	34	19	18
Level 3 (meeting standard):	124	74	67
Number Not Meeting Standard*:			
Level 2 (below standard):	249	176	120
Level 1 (below standard):	212	139	130
Insufficient Evidence	67	23	24
Total	686	431	359
Percent meeting standard including students with Insufficient Evidence or no data	23%	22%	24%

Table 8: Number of Students Achieving Standards the WAAS in 2003 by Grade, Reading

	4th	7th	10th
Number of Students:			
Number Who Met Standard*:			
Level 4 (exceeding standard):	31	22	19
Level 3 (meeting standard):	138	64	70
Number Not Meeting Standard*:			
Level 2 (below standard):	269	187	117
Level 1 (below standard):	206	137	123
Insufficient Evidence	49	25	30
Total	693	435	359
Percent meeting standard including students with Insufficient Evidence or no data	24%	20%	25%

Table 9: Number of Students Achieving Standards the WAAS in 2003 by Grade, Writing

	4th	7th	10th
Number of Students:			
Number Who Met Standard*:			
Level 4 (exceeding standard):	22	21	20
Level 3 (meeting standard):	122	69	68
Number Not Meeting Standard*:			
Level 2 (below standard):	256	169	114
Level 1 (below standard):	214	147	123
Insufficient Evidence	75	26	32
Total	689	432	357
Percent meeting standard including students with Insufficient Evidence or no data	21%	21%	25%

Table 10: Number of Students Achieving Standards the WAAS in 2003 by Grade, Communication

	4th	7th	10th
Number of Students:			
Number Who Met Standard*:			
Level 4 (exceeding standard):	23	14	20
Level 3 (meeting standard):	111	63	61
Number Not Meeting Standard*:			
Level 2 (below standard):	223	169	121
Level 1 (below standard):	144	120	96
Insufficient Evidence	161	58	57
Total	662	424	355
Percent meeting standard including students with Insufficient Evidence or no data	20%	18%	23%

Table 11: Number of Students Achieving Standards the WAAS in 2003 by Grade, Science

	8th	10th
Number of Students:		
Number Who Met Standard*:		
Level 4 (exceeding standard):	15	12
Level 3 (meeting standard):	18	49
Number Not Meeting Standard*:		
Level 2 (below standard):	76	87
Level 1 (below standard):	60	139
Insufficient Evidence	3	35
Total	172	322
Percent meeting standard including students with Insufficient Evidence or no data	19%	19%

Appendix A

Alternate Assessment Task Force - 1997 to August 2000

			School District
Ms.	Virginia	Alonzo	Clover Park School District
Ms.	Nancy	Arnold	OSPI
Ms.	Judy	Bean	Colville
Ms.	Sheila	Bell	Central Valley
Mr.	Michael	Cashion	Colville
Ms.	Kathy	Christiansen	ESD 101
Ms.	Marcia	Davidson	Western Washington University
Mr.	Tom	Delaney	
Ms.	Cindy	Egan	Selah School District
Ms.	Linda	Elman	Central Kitsap
Mr.	Ron	Franklin	Green Hill Academic School
Ms.	Faye	Fuchs	ESD 105
Mr.	Forest	Hertlein	Mukilteo
Ms.	Kay	Jakutis	Shoreline
Mr.	Mark	Jewell	Federal Way
Ms.	Debra	Knesal	ESD 114
Mr.	Randy	Lake	Teacher
Mr.	Hans	Landig	Wapato
Ms.	Jeannene	London	North Thurston School District
Mr.	Duncan	MacQuarrie	Tacoma Public Schools
Ms.	Peggy	Mayer-Chelgren	Lake Stevens Middle School
Mr.	Hans	Michielsen	East Valley
Ms.	Darcy	Miller	Washington State University
Ms.	Minnie	Obregon	Wenatchee High School
Ms.	Sandra	Owen	Pullman
Ms.	Abbie	Pack	Richard Gordon Elementary
Ms.	Lois	Parks	Elma
Ms.	Shirley	Ramsey	Tenino-Rainier SD
Ms.	Joan	Seeberger	ESD 113
Mr.	Ron	Sherman	ESD 105
Ms.	Barbara	Tompkins	SEAC
Ms.	Jennifer	Trauffer	Wenatchee
Dr.	Gordon	Wallace	Kiona-Benton School District
Mr.	Ric	Williams	Everett School District

Appendix B

Alternate Assessment Curriculum Work Group - February 2000

Work Group Members

- Lynnda Biek - VI teacher
- Nancy Arnold - OSPI Special Education
- Laura Bolt - Reading Teacher
- Teri Nickerson - Special Ed Teacher
- Tammy Droppo - Math Teacher
- Ginger Alonzo - District Special Ed Admin
- Lesley Thompson - OSPI Reading Specialist
- Jeannene London - Special Ed Teacher
- Joan Seeberger -ESD Special Ed Admin
- Fonda Abbey - Special Ed Teacher
- Holly Seifert - District SLP
- Elaine Talbot - Special Education State Needs Project Coordinator

Facilitators (ILSSA):

- Jacqui Farmer Kearns
- Steve Stafford
- Paula Burdette

Advanced Systems

- Julie Armentrout
- Chris Beesa

Appendix C

Alternate Assessment Advisory Panel - November 2000 to present

Dr. Mark Jewell
Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Director
Federal Way School District

Dr. Gale Hanninen
Director of Special Services
Sumner S. D.

Carla Jackson, Executive Director
Kent School District

Dan Kelly, Director Special Services
West Valley School District

Debra Knesal, Special Education Director
ESD 114, Bremerton

Linda Sullivan-Dudsic, SLP
Bremerton School District

Jeannene London, Teacher
Mark Twain Elem., Pasco School District

Fonda Abbey, Teacher
Evergreen Elem., Clover Park SD

Gail Hasbrouck, School Psychologist
Special Education Services
Yakima School District

Mary O'Leary Christensen
Special Ed Coordinator
Tacoma School District

Carol Johnson
Richland School District

Betsy Minor Reid, Special Serv Coor
North Central ESD 171, Manson SD

Dr. Gary Livingston, Superintendent
Educational Service District 113
Olympia

Lucille Nollette, Asst.
Director/Special Ed
Bellingham School District

Ms. Nancy Skeritt, Assistant Superintendent
Tahoma School District

Rachel Quenemoen, NCEO
National Technical Advisor to States

Mike Jacobsen, Student Support Coordinator
White River School District

Keith Mars, Director of Special Serv
Fife School District

Bev Sweet
FEPP and Parent

Ron Cammaert
Riverside Publishing

OSPI Staff:
Terry Bergeson
Greg Hall
Bob Harmon
Kathy Bartlett

Mary Alice Heuschel
Nancy Arnold
Doug Gill

Participation Guidelines for the Washington Alternate Assessment System

The decision for a student to participate in the Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) must be based on the unique needs of the individual student, not a specific disability category, time spent in the general education classroom, or program placement. The IEP team must ensure that the decision for a student to participate in the WAAS is **not** solely based on prior knowledge that the student would perform poorly on general state tests; ongoing disruptive behavior; the result of excessive or extended absences or social, cultural, or economic differences. Participation in alternate assessments is intended for a very small number of students with significant disabilities.

<u>Participation</u>	<u>Guidelines</u>
<p>IEP Documentation: To be eligible for participation in the WAAS, the student must have a current IEP that documents the need for an alternate assessment in one or more content areas.</p> <p>Assessment Timeline: To participate in the WAAS, the student must be enrolled at the appropriate grade level (4, 7, 8, and 10). Students with no grade level assignment will need to be assessed with at least the same frequency and in the same content areas as their non-disabled peers (approximately at ages 9, 12, 13 and 15).</p> <p>Classroom Assessment: The student is generally <u>unable</u> to demonstrate knowledge on a paper-and-pencil test, even with accommodations.</p>	<p>Instructional Program: The student is engaged in an instructional program guided by the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) in this content area that are substantially below any grade level expectations due to the nature and severity of the student's disability or disabilities; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These disabilities severely limit the student's involvement in the EALRs even with program modifications and adaptations; and • The student requires intensive, individualized instruction in multiple settings in order to acquire knowledge and to accomplish the transfer and generalization of skills in this content area to school, work, home, and community.
For students who meet ALL of the above guidelines:	The student should participate in the State Assessment System through the WAAS portfolio in this content area.

For further information on the participation of students with disabilities in the state's assessment programs, please see *Guidelines for IEP Teams in Determining WASL Assessment Options for Students in Special Education Programs* and *Guidelines for Participation and Testing Accommodations for Special Populations in State Assessment Programs*, Olympia, WA: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. These documents are also available at the following web site:
www.k12.wa.us/specialed/spedassessment/spedassessment.asp

**Completing the Demographic Information for the
2002–2003 Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) Demographic Form**

The WAAS demographic form must be completed with a No. 2 pencil only.

- Box 1** Write student name at the bottom of the grid and fill in the bubbles in the corresponding circles. Be sure to use the same name as recorded on the WASL demographics page.
- Box 2** If applicable, write in district student ID number and fill in corresponding bubbles.
- Box 3** Write in your District and School Code numbers and fill in the corresponding bubbles. Be sure to use the same codes as the WASL.
- Box 4** Write date of birth and fill in corresponding bubbles.
- Box 5** Mark the grade level of the student. (For non-graded students, bubble in grade 4 for age 9, grade 7 for age 12, grade 8 for age 13, and grade 10 for age 15 students as of August 31, 2002).
- Box 6** Indicate the student's primary disability category:
- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|
| DD | Developmental delay | D | Deafness |
| SBD | Serious behavioral disabilities | HH | Hearing impairment |
| OI | Orthopedically impaired | VI | Visually impaired/ blindness |
| HI | Health impaired | DB | Deaf/blindness |
| SLD | Specific learning disability | CD | Communication disordered |
| MR | Mental retardation | AUT | Autism |
| MD | Multiple disabilities | TBI | Traumatic brain injury |
- Box 7** Indicate the assessment option selected for each of the content areas:
- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| W | WASL |
| A | WASL with Accommodations |
| P | WAAS Portfolio |
- Box 8** FOR PORTFOLIO SCORING USE ONLY. Please do not fill in.
- Box 9** Refusal – Bubble in the Y (yes) if the parent has opted out their child from participation in the WAAS portfolio, as specified in the student's IEP. Use the N (no) bubble only if the Y bubble was marked in error.

Student Information Section – Write in the student name, teacher name, school name, and district name with a No. 2 pencil in the student information section so that the appropriate person can be contacted for missing or incorrect information.

Place the WAAS demographic form in the front of the portfolio binder and return the completed portfolio to your district office so that it can be shipped back to OSPI by **May 30, 2003**.

Washington Alternate Assessment Portfolio Scoring Summary

Student Name _____ Portfolio Number _____

Part I: Progress on IEP Skills

(Progress on IEP skills scored separately for each content area entry.)

	1	2	3	4
Progress on IEP Skill linked to EALRs	Little or no progress on targeted skills linked to the EALRs in portfolio entry.	Clear progress on targeted skills linked to the EALRs in portfolio entry.	Attains goal for targeted IEP skills linked to the EALRs in portfolio entry.	Exceeds goal for targeted IEP skills linked to the EALRs in portfolio entry.

CONTENT AREA	PART I SCORE
Communication (Grade 4, 7, 10)	
Reading (Grade 4, 7, 10)	
Writing (Grade 4, 7, 10)	
Mathematics (Grade 4, 7, 10)	
Science (Grade 8 & 10)	

Part II: Student Generalization of Skills

(These dimensions are scored across the entire portfolio.)

Dimension	1	2	3	4	Scorer Use Only
Modifications and Adaptations	No or limited evidence that the student uses supports, modifications, adaptations or assistive technology in portfolio entries.	The student appropriately uses supports, modifications, adaptations or assistive technology in some portfolio entries.	The student appropriately uses supports, modifications, adaptations or assistive technology in most portfolio entries.	The student appropriately uses natural supports, modifications, adaptations or assistive technology within and across all portfolio entries.	
Settings and Contexts	Student participates in a limited number of settings or use of targeted skills unclear in portfolio entries.	Student performs targeted skills in some settings or contexts in some portfolio entries.	Student performs targeted skills in a variety of settings or contexts in most portfolio entries.	Student performs targeted skills in an extensive variety of settings or contexts within and across all portfolio entries.	
Social Relationships	The student has no or limited social interactions during activities with others, both with and without disabilities, in portfolio entries	The student has some social interactions during activities with others, with and without disabilities, in some portfolio entries.	The student has sustained social interactions during activities with others, with and without disabilities, in most portfolio entries.	The student has varied, sustained social interactions during activities with others, with and without disabilities, in all portfolio entries.	
Self-Determination	The student makes no or limited choices in planning, monitoring, or evaluating own activities in the portfolio entries.	The student makes some choices in planning, monitoring, or evaluating own activities in some portfolio entries.	The student makes choices in planning, monitoring, or evaluating own activities in most portfolio entries.	The student consistently makes choices in planning, monitoring, or evaluating own activities within and across all portfolio entries.	

**Washington Alternate Assessment System Portfolio
Academic Achievement Standard Descriptions**

The academic achievement standards for students with significant disabilities who are participating in the Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) portfolio are significantly different than the standards for students who participate in the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). The WAAS portfolio is based on the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR) Extensions which allow the student to participate and progress in the general curriculum. Because the WAAS portfolio is based on the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals in relation to the EALR Extensions, the specific assessment targets selected for the student may be the same for many content areas but may be different than for any other student. Additionally, these students have educational goals that may remain the same throughout their educational careers. Therefore, the following academic achievement standard descriptors apply for all grades and content areas.

Level 1 - Students performing at this level will be making little or no progress toward the goal for the targeted IEP skills linked to the EALRs. The student is unable to generalize the use of these targeted skills, using modifications and adaptations in any settings or contexts. The student cannot make choices in planning, monitoring or evaluating own performances. The student has no or limited social interactions with others during educational activities.

Level 2 - Students performing at this level will be making some progress toward the goal for the targeted IEP skills linked to the EALRs. The student is able to generalize the use of these targeted skills in some ways. The student may appropriately use modifications and adaptations in some settings and contexts or make choices in planning, monitoring or evaluating own performances. The student may have some social interactions with others during educational activities. The student is not able to generalize the targeted IEP skills in all of these ways.

Level 3 - Students performing at this level will be making clear progress or attaining the goal for the targeted IEP skills linked to the EALRs. The student is able to generalize the use of these targeted skills, appropriately using modifications and adaptations in a variety of settings and contexts while making choices in planning, monitoring or evaluating own performances. The student sustains some social interactions with others during educational activities.

Level 4 - Students performing at this level will be attaining or exceeding the goal for the targeted IEP skills linked to the EALRs. The student is able to generalize the use of these targeted skills, appropriately using natural supports, modifications or adaptations in an extensive variety of settings or contexts while consistently making choices in planning, monitoring or evaluating own performances. The student has sustained, varied social interactions with others during educational activities.

Appendix H**Relationship Among Total Score, Level and Score Patterns**

Total Score	Level	Pattern				
		Cont	M & A	S & C	S R	S D
20	4	4	4	4	4	4
19	4	3	4	4	4	4
18	4	3	4	4	4	3
18	3	2	4	4	4	4
17	4	3	4	4	3	3
16	4	3	4	4	3	2
16	3	2	4	4	3	3
16	2	1	4	4	4	3
15	3	4	3	3	2	3
15	2	1	4	4	3	3
14	3	2	4	3	1	4
14	2	1	4	4	3	2
13	3	4	1	3	3	2
13	3	3	4	2	2	2
13	3	2	3	3	3	2
12	3	3	3	2	2	2
12	3	3	1	3	3	2
12	3	2	4	2	2	2
12	2	1	3	3	2	3
11	2	3	4	1	1	2
11	2	2	3	2	2	2
11	2	1	4	2	2	2
10	2	2	4	1	1	2
10	2	1	1	3	2	3
9	2	2	3	2	1	1
9	2	1	4	1	1	2
8	2	1	2	2	2	1
8	2	3	2	1	1	1
8	2	1	3	2	1	1
7	1	2	2	1	1	1
6	1	1	2	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1

Cont – Content Area – Communication, Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science

M & A - Modifications and Adaptations

S & C - Settings and Contexts

SR - Social Relationships

SD - Self-Determination